

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended to correct grammatical informalities. No new issue has been raised which would require the Examiner to conduct a further search.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dev et al. (US 5,559,955). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) the features of the problem alarm notifying part for displaying an alarm with respect to the specified device which is causing the problem and influencing another device.

In response to Applicants' last Amendment, the Examiner argues that the Dev et al. reference provides the connections between the models of the virtual network machine, and that each model has a corresponding network device and gives information concerning a "cause of the alarm." Therefore, the Dev et al. reference discloses the claimed problem alarm notifying part. He cites column 8, lines 29-45 of the reference in support of his argument.

The fact that a model in a virtual network machine includes a corresponding network device, and the relationship between each model is known, does not disclose or suggest specifying which device is actually causing the problem so that an alarm is displayed with respect to that specified device which is causing the problem and influencing another device. In the portion of the reference cited for disclosing the claimed problem alarm notifying part, it states that the "alarm log selects the most severe alarm for each model which is registering an alarm" (col. 8, lines 30-31). While the reference may disclose

determining a model that is registering an alarm, and therefore, the corresponding network device, the alarm associated with the model and its corresponding network device are not necessarily the devices which are causing the problem and influencing another device. For example, the model/corresponding network device registering an alarm may be the “another device” which is being influenced, and not this “specified device which is causing the problem.” In other words, even if Dev et al. discloses that a model in a virtual network machine includes a corresponding network device, and the relationship between each model is known, it still does not disclose features for specifying device which is actually causing the problem and influencing another device. For example, the present invention, as shown in Fig. 10C, have predefined definition of influence between two devices having a relationship with each other. Dev et al. does not disclose or suggest these features of the present invention.

Moreover, an alarm log message including an “alarm cause”, as in Dev et al., also does not disclose the specified device which is causing the problem. The type of “alarm cause” contemplated in Dev. et al. refers to information relating to the calculation of an error rate for a corresponding network device. An example of an “alarm cause” given in Dev et al. is merely an error rate of a network device being above a predetermined limit (see col. 8, line 63 – col. 9, line 5). Accordingly, the “alarm cause” of the type disclosed in Dev et al. does not disclose an alarm which is displayed with respect to the specified device which is causing the problem and influencing another device.

For these reasons, independent claims 1, 7 and 13 and their respective dependent claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 are allowable over Dev et al. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Joe Kim", with a stylized flourish at the end.

B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

October 28, 2004

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978